

Date: Wed, 27 Jan 93 04:30:19 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #23  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 27 Jan 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    23

Today's Topics:

                    Abandonment of CW  
            Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 26 Jan 93 11:49:56 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!gatech!udel!gvls1!gvls2!ean@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Abandonment of CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan25.154312.145481@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>  
>  
> However, today, little, if any, of the government radio communications  
>operations, use CW. It seems that government traffic is now either voice  
>or automated digital (such as FEC packet).  
>

Yep, even the US Coast Guard is giving up CW on August 1, 1993, and  
going to be using SSB.

If you want the full text of this, see the Federal Register of January  
19, 1993, page 4194. Or if you can get the information from the USCG  
ask for CGD 92-078.

--

Ed Naratil

Amateur Packet: w3bnr@N3LA.#epa.PA.USA.NA

(All standard disclaimers apply)

ean@VFL.Paramax.COM

-----  
Date: 26 Jan 93 10:28:40 EST

From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!sdd.hp.com!ncr-sd!ncrcae!ncrhub2!ncrgw2!psinntp!  
arrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I want to bring this discussion to a close, since it's pretty clear  
that there is no meeting of the minds likely, but...

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <1041@arrl.org> jlbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom) writes:

>>But few of the subjects discussed in this forum include depth of  
>>feeling as a relevant issue. In short, my views on the subject of  
>>open vs closed repeaters (just to pick an example :-) aren't in the  
>>least influenced by whether the subject gets you--or Jay--hopping  
>>mad. Rather, I'm swayed by cogent reasoning well articulated.

>

>In this case, I felt that it was necessary to express my disapproval of  
>someone's advocacy of jamming as a legitimate means of social change in the  
>strongest possible terms. I believe that there is no room in ham radio - or,  
>indeed, any civilized society - for such terrorism. Mr. Bly's advocacy is no  
>different from Islamic Jihad's advocacy of blowing up school buses as a means  
>of achieving its desired results - whether or not the results are desirable,  
>the means are simply unacceptable.

>

>How would you have expressed the same sentiment as the one I expressed,  
>clearly and succinctly?

How about:

"I believe that there is no room in ham radio - or, indeed, any civilized  
society - for such terrorism. Mr. Bly's advocacy is no different from  
Islamic Jihad's advocacy of blowing up school buses as a means of  
achieving its desired results - whether or not the results are desirable,  
the means are simply unacceptable."

To me, that's a lot more compelling than your original statement.

[deleted]

>I do not claim to be a master of language, although that is for me a desirable  
>goal. I do claim to be able to use it reasonably well. My decision to use the

>language I did was conscious, and clearly arrived at. That you choose not to  
>believe that does not change it.

>

>>When used improperly in

>>place of reason, profanity merely indicates that the speaker's hormone

>>level exceeds his IQ.

>

>This is the fatal flaw in your argument: it is not always used in place of  
>reason. There are times where there is simply no suitable alternative.

Untrue, and to quote an unimpeachable source (-:-), "that you choose not  
to believe that does not change it." The inability--or unwillingness--to  
exercise the judgement required to know when and when not to use a given  
style of language--including profanity--is the root problem.

-----

Jon Bloom, KE3Z		jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League		Justice is being allowed to do whatever
225 Main St.		I like. Injustice is whatever prevents
Newington, CT 06111		my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

-----

Date: 26 Jan 1993 17:03:34 GMT

From: saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!  
oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C1DHyE.3Kz@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>, <1k1ilmINNb7m@tamsun.tamu.edu>,  
<Jan25.214455.59042@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>tmc

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <Jan25.214455.59042@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>  
gw214790@LANCE.ColoState.Edu (Galen Watts) writes:

>And if we also did Texas, we could reduce the static bandwidth by about  
>99.9%. Between you and Maynard, you guys post about 90% of this group.

>Do you guys in Texas work?

Sure. I have a system maintenance job running at the moment, and am waiting on  
it to finish.

Kurt, Jim, and I only post about half of the group, though; the open repeater  
comrades and the prudes take up the rest.

>Close whatever repeater you want. If I work simplex on the output, what are  
>ya gonna do about it.

If I can't hear you, I'm going to use the repeater anyway. Do you often engage  
in jamming?

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I don't want to read poor Microsoft bashing. I want to read good  
Microsoft bashing." -- Douglas A. Bell, in comp.os.os2.advocacy (Me too!)

-----

Date: 26 Jan 1993 17:01:51 GMT

From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!  
oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C1DHye.3Kz@hpuaerca.atl.hp.com>, <8530@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<paulf.727986796@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>u

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <paulf.727986796@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>

paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>This is probably the most valid argument for closed repeaters. It simply is  
>not fair to expect access to someone else's station, period. Other factors  
>may enter into the decision, but in the end, the only fair procedure is to  
>let the trustee make the open/closed judgement.

Amen. Why can't the open repeater comrades understand this?

>This issue is only relevant when all of the spectrum in a particular band is  
>in use, a phenomenon peculiar to a few urban centers. In most of those  
>centers, sanctions are not permanent; the continuance of a sanction is a  
>value judgement of the coordinating body. So, if open systems have inherently  
>higher value, then obtaining a sanction over that of a closed (and little used)  
>system is trivial.

The problem is that that requires a value judgment. That way lie lawsuits  
galore; coordinators simply aren't going to change rules in midstream and open  
themselves up to this kind of massive liability. I have yet to see anyone in  
this discussion volunteer to accept the liability themselves. I'm the one in  
the trenches. There are a lot of folks willing to put me in legal jeopardy,  
but don't want it themselves.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I don't want to read poor Microsoft bashing. I want to read good  
Microsoft bashing." -- Douglas A. Bell, in comp.os.os2.advocacy (Me too!)

-----

Date: 26 Jan 93 18:49:10 GMT

From: yuma!gw214790@purdue.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1k1ilmINNb7m@tamsun.tamu.edu>,  
<Jan25.214455.59042@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>, <8556@lib.tmc.edu>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <8556@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:  
>In article <Jan25.214455.59042@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>  
gw214790@LANCE.ColoState.Edu (Galen Watts) writes:  
>>Close whatever repeater you want. If I work simplex on the output, what are  
>>ya gonna do about it.  
>  
>If I can't hear you, I'm going to use the repeater anyway. Do you often engage  
>in jamming?  
>Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
>jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

No. I never jam, unless other musicians are present.  
Galen Watts, KF0YJ and Bassist.

-----

Date: 26 Jan 1993 16:59:23 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!  
oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C19xn1.EAJ@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>, <8527@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<C1FF6o.n5A@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>ib  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <C1FF6o.n5A@hpuerca.atl.hp.com> jab@hpuerca.atl.hp.com (Alan Barrow)  
writes:  
>I do believe that you are the one complaining about the problem. The  
>regs say what they say. You can limit the repeater to specific users is  
>permissable. How can you limit it? You can:  
> 1) Turn it off  
> 2) Secure it  
> 3) Make it unfriendly.

OK, so you agree that closed repeaters are permissible. Good.

I had (incorrectly, it appears) assumed that you agreed with Gary that closed  
repeaters are not what the sentence meant. My apologies.

>The regs do not make any specific protection for closed repeaters when  
>they have vacated the frequency. In fact, the only specific mention

>of frequencies is that no one "Owns" a specific frequency.

This argument applies to open repeaters as well as closed repeaters...so the same tactics you espouse apply equally to open and closed repeaters. Guess what? You've just sanctioned repeater wars.

>So, you can do what you wish, but the repeater trustee is making a  
>conscious decision to repeat a signal present on it's input. If you do  
>not want someone to play with your toys, lock them up.

Exactly what the closed repeater operators are saying they're doing.

>But don't expect sympathy or legal protection, as there is none. I am not  
>aware of a single case of the FCC taking action against a \*legal\* but  
>uninvited user on a closed repeater.

So? That doesn't mean we can't run him off....and if he chooses not to leave, he eventually gets himself into a jamming mode.

>You continue to miss the point. (This is getting boring.) Using the  
>link is not restricted. If it is not convenient for the trustee/club  
>members to have the link up, they can take it down. Or go into into  
>"SSSM" (Super Secret Secure Mode). This is a technical issue, not  
>a political one. (Sure Comrade.... One local group has they saying:  
>"Hitler owns the hub" :- ) IE: they do whatever they want.)

OK...so what does being a club member get you, then? You've just said that nonmembers can use the links. If we do not wish to have someone who does not support the system use the links, then your utopia has us either dropping the link when someone who does not support the system gets on, or putting up with them.

>Where did I say open all functions to all users in my statement? You  
>continue to twist words.

No, I'm simply carrying them to their logical conclusions, as applied to our situation.

> It does not cost many thousands to keep it running. It is  
> quite reasonable. Power bills are the largest expense. We get  
> good sites for free. Based on the general asinine attitude  
> exhibited by the closed repeater crowd, I am not suprised  
> you are having to pay for sites. (I would not offer my back yard  
> to a group that appears to need litigation to defend their  
> lack of technical proficiency)

On the other hand, there are high sites on hills around Atlanta. The only high sites in most of Texas - certainly the most populated parts - are skinny and

steel, or building tops that, for the most part, are controlled by commercial interests. Eastern Texas is \_flat\_.

> Using the link is not restricted. Turning it on or off, or  
> adding sites to the link is. The motive to join is to be able  
> to control the link. Depending on someone else to have the  
> links up is not that useful. (The full time links are open to  
> all, regardless.) Many new members join because an existing  
> member brought up the link to allow someone to have a qso.

Whoopee. In our experience, this simply leads to freeloaders who badger folks to turn the links on or off so they can talk to their buddies across the state. The system is not a public utility, yet the folks who don't wish to help support it think that it should be. Your experience may differ, but I'm telling you what happened here, and why we made this decision. You may disagree in your case, but don't presume to tell us what happened to us.

>1) I demand nothing. Do what you wish. Do not be suprised if you have  
>co channel repeaters in the future.

Unless the Texas VHF-FM Society's membership votes to impose cochanneling on closed repeaters, this simply will not happen. If they vote to do so, I will resign my directorship immediately; I do not wish to assume the liability that that will bring. I suspect that most of the other officers, directors, and frequency coordinators will do the same.

>2) As a repeater operator, I have the choices you list (open or closed).  
>I can say, "sorry OM, we do not leave the link up while unattended." Or  
>"sorry OM, I would like to finish the QSO with XYZ". "Sorry OM, we are  
>doing some testing, so the repeater is unavailable."

...and you'll get complaints, and jamming, and expectations, and freeloaders.

>All of these allow you to run the rpters as you wish, without generating  
>ill will. Unlike what I have rcv'd in CA on closed rpters- "Sorry OM,  
>please do not use this repeater, you are not a club member."

What's the difference? The effects are exactly the same, if you do not wish to run a public utility. The folks in California are honest about it; you're evading the issue.

>No explanation, nothing but rudeness.

An honest statement without evasions.

>Funny how the FCC and the rest of the US shares my opinion. (with the  
>exception of CA, and maybe 6 other systems.) Nope, I do not have to  
>defend my views, as they seem to be the majority.

Based on what? The FCC certainly does not share your opinion; you need look no farther than 97.205(e) to see that. Debates on Usenet certainly aren't representative of the ham opinion in the US.

>>"I have discovered a wonderful proof, but this margin is too small to contain  
>>it."

>Quite the clever wordsmith, are we?

I wish I could claim it, but I cannot; it's the comment associated with Fermat's Last Theorem. The giggle value comes from the fact that, in the hundred or so years since he made the comment, the best mathematicians have tried and failed to duplicate his proof.

>Nothing I discovered. But I will not  
>disclose it, for the same reason that AMSAT does not disclose it's control  
>methods. Do you care to publish Cactus's link and control frequencies,  
>control methods, etc?

No...but bragging about a technical solution, then refusing to describe it, is simply blowing smoke. Like Fermat's Last Theorem, I have no way to verify the truth of your statements.

>This is a waste of time. I am starting to suspect it is not the fact  
>that your system is closed, but rather your personality. Enjoy your  
>system while you can.

Tell that to the folks we've brought into the group in the past year.

I expect to enjoy my system for quite a while, thank you; open repeater communism isn't in vogue in Texas.

>Why, then, do you imply that everyone wants to use your system. I do  
>not. From what I can tell it doesn't offer much I do not have access to  
>currently.

Maybe not you, in particular; there have been several comments in this discussion that have implied that folks would come to town and use the repeater, invited or not. (A moot point: we welcome transients without reservations or exceptions.)

>Now, now, .... These guys never did anything to you. I just quote them  
>as an example of why a properly designed system does not need to be  
>closed. Maybe are you jealous? Why the personal attack on a group you  
>have no knowledge of?

You held them out as representative of the open repeater comrades. If so, then they would want my repeater to be open. If not, then why did you bring them



up?

>No, just not as asinine as others appear to be. Annual membership in the  
>\$20-30 range. It has gone down as user base increased. They have added  
>features and repeaters every year. All non-members are welcome as well.  
>(I am currently not a member. But I am allways welcome.)

How much do they get to use their own system? I've been involved in a repeater club with 600 members before; there was seldom room to get a word in edgewise.

[why closed repeaters will fade away:]

>Population density. Lack of technical innovation. lack of resources.

>NBFM becomes obsolete. Cheaper cellular makes ham radio obsolete.

>Phil Karn gets us all Qualcomm units. :-)

The last few of those will be equally as hard on open repeaters as well as closed ones. The others all assume that closed repeaters will be outlawed; I seriously doubt that that will happen.

>Enjoy the path you have choosen.

I will. It is those who wish me to change my path that I am now, and will continue to, argue against.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I don't want to read poor Microsoft bashing. I want to read good  
Microsoft bashing." -- Douglas A. Bell, in comp.os.os2.advocacy (Me too!)

-----  
Date: 26 Jan 93 18:52:27 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C17Mx0.2Fu@sugar.neosoft.com>, <1993Jan24.182428.28564@ke4zv.uucp>,  
<8532@lib.tmc.edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <8532@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:  
>In article <1993Jan24.182428.28564@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:

>>Slander, or libel as Jay says, is the type of risk you open yourself  
>>up to when you have a publication. Reasonably prudent publishers carry  
>>insurance for such cases, and exercise some editorial care not to spread  
>>gossip or tell tales out of school.

>

>We exercised such care, which is why the case had little legal foundation in  
>the first place. Insurance? Have you priced such lately?

Yes, it's about \$0.25 per \$1,000.

>>Gannett gets sued about once a week  
>>on average. We never settle, we nearly never lose, and we never let a suit  
>>interfere with the conduct of our business. In fact, it's turned into a  
>>minor profit center for the company since we've started getting damage  
>>awards for frivolous suits under tort reform.

>

>Gannett is also several orders of magnitude larger than the Texas VHF-FM  
>Society, and can afford to defend such cases vigorously.

But the Texas VHF-FM society isn't getting sued once a week. For the  
\*one\* suit you guys have suffered, you should have drilled the SOB  
into the ground with a countersuit and fattened your treasury. Surely  
you people keep a lawyer on retainer, it's only a couple hundred bucks  
a year, just to write nasty letters and file complaints. Most of the  
organizations I belong to do. One of the clubs has a lawyer member  
who'll do such cases pro bono.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #23

\*\*\*\*\*